

Statement Of The Substance Of The Interview

On August 20, 2007, S. Dean Taylor and Thomas E. Lees, on behalf of the applicants, conducted a telephone interview with Examiner Brinich. Sincere thanks are once again expressed to the Examiner for the time and consideration extended to the applicants. No demonstrations were utilized. Additionally, no exhibits were transmitted to the Examiner.

During the interview, the invention described in Claim 1 of the applicants' application was discussed in general terms, and the disclosures of U.S. Pat. No. 5,933,184 to Ishigami et al. (hereinafter, *Ishigami*) was discussed with respect to Claim 1. The thrust of the Examiner's arguments was analogous to those set out in the Office action dated September 27, 2007.

The thrust of the applicants' arguments was that *Ishigami* fails to disclose, teach or suggest at least a method of electronically compensating for process direction position errors of a laser beam ... comprising ... converting a laser beam scan path model into a Pel profile that characterizes process direction position errors of Pels written by a laser ... and warping a bitmap image based upon the Pel profile prior to writing the bitmap image by the laser beam, as claimed in Claim 1. The applicants argued that *Ishigami* teaches correcting for laser beam position errors in the scanning direction, i.e., in the direction in which the laser beam is scanned across the photoconductive drum. *Ishigami* discloses performing this correction by altering the timing of a video clock that controls modulation of the scanning laser beam so as to alter the position of pixels comprising the video image in the main scanning direction. The claimed invention, however, addresses the correction of position errors in the process direction, which is orthogonal to the scan direction. Moreover, the process direction correction comprises warping a bitmap image. *Ishigami* does not teach or suggest any modification to the bitmap image. Further details of the thrust of the applicants' arguments are substantially as set out in the remarks section of this paper.

The Examiner agreed that, based upon the applicants' comments and clarifying explanations, claim 1 defines over *Ishigami*. The Examiner further indicated that an amendment should be filed setting out these arguments, but that an updated search may be required. No other agreements were reached between the parties.